



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,281	03/24/2004	Franz Fischer	6579-0622	3945

7590
Richard R. Michaud
The Michaud-Duffy Group, LLP
Suite 206
306 Industrial Park Road
Middletown, CT 06457

11/14/2008

EXAMINER

PETERSON, KENNETH E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/807,281

Applicant(s)

FISCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34, 36 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34, 36 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 34,36 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawara et al. (5,046,249) in view of Althaus (5,214,851), and further in view of Apprille, Jr. (4,756,082) and/or Stiles (2004/0035003).

Kawara shows a unitary razor body with all of the limitations as seen in figure 9. The flywheel vibration device (150-152) is in proximity to the blade mount (132). The blade is vibrated along its cutting edge (lines 43-45, column 2).

Kawara's motor and eccentric flywheel are mounted directly in the head region instead of having an intermediate sleeve. However, the use of an intermediate sleeve is well known as shown by Althaus (6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have sleeved Kawara's motor and eccentric flywheel, as taught by Althaus, in order to provide a sturdier vibration device that is easier to install.

In regards to the recitation of there being an angle between the head region and handle region, Examiner takes Official Notice that such a feature is ubiquitous in modern razors. Some examples of this are the references to Apprille and Stiles. Additional references can be supplied if needed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have further modified Kawara by angling the head region (30) relative to the handle region (10), as suggested by Apprille and Stiles and dozens of

other references, in order to create a concavity on the skin-facing side of the razor, such that protruding body parts do not interfere with the motion of the handle.

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 6 of Applicant's response, Applicant argues that Kawara's motor and flywheel are located in the handle region and not in the head region. However, Applicant has not adequately defined these regions enough to make that argument. Looking at Kawara's figure 4, it is very reasonable to say that the "handle region" extends from the bottom of the figure up to numeral 72, and that the "head region" extends from numeral 70 up to the top of the figure. Note that Kawara's element 30 is the "head", so it is clearly acceptable to call this area the "head region". There is nothing in Applicant's claims that precludes this very reasonable interpretation. Accordingly, Examiner IS NOT "moving" the motor and flywheel from one region to the other, since it they were already in the head region to begin with.

Applicant further argues that the Examiner's justifications for the modifications are misguided. However, Applicant never explicitly critiques why Examiner's justifications are undesirable. Applicant is reminded, as per the KSR decision, the suggestion need not be implicit. For example, in this case, one of ordinary skill in the would recognize that Althaus's structure was an equivalent way of doing the same thing, and this knowledge would suggest to one of ordinary skill the ability to swap parts between Kawara and Althaus.

Applicant argues that to utilize Althaus's sleeve in Kawara's head, after angling, one would need to "enlarge the head and neck of the Kawara device to a size capable of enabling the sleeve to make the turn...". This argument is following a line of logic that no manufacturer would take. The motor and flywheel (with or without sleeve) can easily be assemble in the head region prior to the head region being attached to the handle region (angled or not).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Peterson whose telephone number is (571)272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kenneth Peterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724